

in terms of what we do in the world. No one will fight harder than I against these monkeyshines of nontariff barriers. In my judgment, the best posture for us to fight them elsewhere is to try to avoid them as much as possible ourselves.

So for both reasons—first, because the consumer has a burning interest in imports which tend to give him an element of competition in this country in respect to price, service, quality, and so forth; and second, because of the tremendous web of international trade which is involved in meat, a very important commodity—I am glad we have had this colloquy.

I am obliged to the Senator from Nebraska for making the modification in the amendment, and I am reassured as to the way in which this matter is now to be handled.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

One thing should be made clear as a result of this colloquy: While there is no intention to establish what are sometimes called nontrade barriers, because the intent, the language, and the entire legislative history of the bill indicate that we are merely trying to have uniformity among not only domestic producers—but also exporters to this country—no higher or lower standards for foreign exporters than for domestic producers—still, because of the increased requirements that will be established by the act, some domestic producers will find that their costs of production will rise, because they will not otherwise be able to meet the standards of quality and sanitation for American consumers.

By the same token, it would be rather surprising if some foreign exporters did not find that their cost of production had increased, because unless they can meet the new standards, they will not be able to export to the United States.

This is an equal-standards proposition. The sole objective is to protect the American consuming public. I hope that that is clearly understood. If anyone should suggest that the bill might tend to undercut the Kennedy round, he had better begin to do his homework, because nothing in the Kennedy round indicates that we cannot establish standards for the protection of quality and sanitation of meat products for American consumers. If the bill provided higher standards for imported products than for domestic products, that would be something else. But it does not do anything of the kind, and it is not intended that it should.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I have said before, I think that the colloquy has made clear the intent of the bill, because we have had no hearings on the amendment. I am satisfied that the manager of the bill will in good faith seek to carry out the basic thrust and intent, which are to implement rather than to add to the terms of the bill.

EFFORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS WITH TESTIMONY FROM SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK ON U.S. POLICIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on a non-germane subject and to have printed in the RECORD certain letters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish briefly to lay before the Senate the record of the effort of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and its chairman, Senator FULBRIGHT, to hold a public hearing with testimony from the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, on U.S. policies in Southeast Asia and in Vietnam particularly.

It was nearly 2 years ago, on February 18, 1966, that the Secretary of State last appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations in public session to discuss these policies with it and with the American people. At that time, the Senate will recall, there was a most fruitful examination of our policies. These hearings were informative and aroused widespread public interest. There was a most favorable public response, because these hearings were education in the best sense of the word.

On a few occasions since February of 1966, Secretary Rusk has been asked questions about our Vietnam policies in public sessions which have been devoted primarily to other subjects such as foreign aid and the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union. The Secretary has refused, however, to discuss policies in Vietnam in public session with the committee, which means that he has refused to testify before the committee in public session and be interrogated by members of the Foreign Relations Committee in public session.

In my view, Mr. President, the people have a right to know what our policies are in Southeast Asia. What are the goals of these policies? Are these goals realistic? For what cause are young men sent to fight and die? Is this truly in our national interest? What more important questions than these should engage the consideration of the committee? Upon what graver subjects should there be public communication between the executive and legislative branches? How can either the President or the Senate discharge their respective responsibilities to the American people without incisive public examination of these policies and questions?

It might be well to note, Mr. President, that Secretary Rusk, Ambassador

Bunker, and General Westmoreland have been interrogated on television. Indeed, Secretary Rusk has been interrogated at press conferences, by students at university appearances, on television, both foreign and domestic. I do not criticize this. Indeed, such appearances are commendable, but they are neither to be compared in probative value nor substituted for the constitutional responsibilities involved in public testimony at which responsible and informed Senators can question and examine responsible executive officials on the validity of vital policies of war or peace.

A student arising from an auditorium may be allowed one question and be given a brief answer. A reporter at a press conference may be shushed with a no comment reply, but in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, clothed with both constitutional duty and powers, the questions can be examined more incisively. The questions both require and deserve careful and thorough examination and, always consistent with national security, need to be examined to the fullest extent in the full view of the American people.

Mr. President, there have been a number of letters exchanged between Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Secretary of State, Dean Rusk.

I list the efforts the committee has made to persuade the Secretary that such an appearance would be in the public interest.

On December 21, 1966, the chairman of the committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, wrote Secretary Rusk inviting him early in 1967 and at his convenience to meet with it to discuss "the progress of the pacification program in Vietnam, recent developments in mainland China and their relation to the war in Vietnam, our military and economic activities in Thailand" and certain other subjects. That letter expressed the "hope that this first meeting of the 90th Congress could be in open session because all of these subjects are of great interest to the American people." The letter stated explicitly that "there may be questions that you will not be able to answer in open session and the committee will therefore make arrangements for an additional closed session if necessary."

On December 30, 1966, Secretary Rusk replied to the committee stating that he would "be very happy to meet with the committee at any time" and that he looked "forward to a thorough review and discussion of such matters as the members may care to raise."

The letter from Secretary Rusk continued, suggesting that "my first meeting with the committee be in executive session," in accord with previous practice. This executive session, wrote the Secretary, "could be followed, if the committee wishes, by a public meeting at a convenient time." He continued:

November 28, 1967

I fully agree that the great issues of American foreign policy are of interest to the American people as a whole, and I am glad to cooperate with the Committee's effort to facilitate public discussion and understanding.

The committee accepted that suggestion, and on January 16, 1967, Secretary Rusk met with the committee in secret session to discuss the general world situation. At that meeting the Secretary was agreeable to a subsequent public appearance and the date of January 23, 1967 was set for that meeting.

Shortly prior to January 23, however, Secretary Rusk asked the chairman of the committee to change the subject of the public session so that it could be devoted to testimony on the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union. That change was accepted by the committee. I might note parenthetically, however, that this was the second go-around on the subject of the Consular Convention. The committee had held hearings and favorably reported the Consular Convention the previous session, but no action was taken by the Senate, thus requiring the hearing and reporting process to be repeated in the new session.

Be that as it may, subsequent efforts made at the staff level to arrange for the Secretary to meet with the committee at a convenient time and in public were not fruitful.

Finally on April 27, 1967, the chairman of the committee wrote to Secretary Rusk as follows:

APRIL 27, 1967.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You will recall that earlier this year the Committee on Foreign Relations requested you to appear in public session to discuss the role and responsibilities of the United States as a great power, but you were unable to accept those invitations.

In view of the important events which have taken place since then, would you be willing to appear in public session for a general discussion of our foreign policy, with special attention to Southeast Asia, on Tuesday, May 2, or Tuesday, May 9? It would be helpful to the Committee and to the public understanding of our policy if you could arrange to be with us.

Very truly yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

On May 2, 1967, Secretary Rusk replied to the chairman as follows:

MAY 2, 1967.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 27.

I would be glad to have a general discussion of our foreign policy, with special attention to Southeast Asia, with the Foreign Relations Committee. It seems to me, however, that the value of such a discussion could be greatly enhanced if it were held in *Executive session*. It is not easy for the Secretary of State to discuss particular situations in particular countries in public without risking considerable damage to our foreign relations. A public session would carry with it, therefore, many of the inhibitions which attend a press conference. An *Executive session* would permit a candid exchange of views and could be valuable, it seems to me, both to the Committee and to myself. I would see no objection to a mutual review of the transcript of an Executive session to

determine whether substantial portions of it might be made public.

If the procedure is agreeable to the Committee, I would be pleased to appear on Tuesday, May 9, or Tuesday, May 16, whichever would be more convenient for the Committee.

With every good wish,
Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

And on May 3, the chairman replied as follows:

MAY 3, 1967.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In reply to your letter of May 2, the Committee will be very pleased to have you in Executive Session on May 16 at 10:00 AM.

I regret that you do not wish to appear in public session, as I think the general public would benefit very much by a discussion of our present situation.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

There the subject rested until October 12, 1967. At that time the chairman wrote to Secretary of State Rusk as follows:

OCTOBER 12, 1967.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of recent discussion on the Senate Floor regarding the need for public enlightenment with respect to our policies in Vietnam, I take this occasion to renew my past invitations that you appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations in public session to discuss issues raised by our policies there.

I would be very happy to consult with your staff to work out an appropriate time for your appearance.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

On October 19, 1967, Secretary Rusk replied to the chairman as follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1967.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of October 12 in which you suggested I appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations in public session to discuss issues raised by our policy in Vietnam.

For the reasons I have mentioned to you in earlier exchanges, I believe our meeting would be of greater value and, at the same time, run less risk of damaging our foreign relations in this critically important time if it were held in executive session. An executive session would, of course, permit a more candid exchange of views which I believe would be valuable both to the Committee and to myself.

Following such a meeting I think it would be useful for us to review the transcript in order to reach agreement as to whether substantial portions of it could be made public. As you know, this procedure has been used many times in the past, and, it seems to me, would best meet the Committee's and our requirements.

With all best wishes,
Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

Not satisfied with the Secretary's letter of October 19, the full Committee on Foreign Relations discussed the subject at its business meeting of October 31. At that meeting I took the position, and so moved, that the Committee on Foreign Relations should instruct its chairman

to communicate directly with the President of the United States, expressing the concern of the committee at the refusal of the Secretary of State to meet with the committee to discuss with it in public session the American involvement in southeast Asia.

I withdrew that motion, however, when another member suggested a course of action which I thought reasonable; namely, that the Secretary of State be invited to meet with the committee to explain why he was refusing to appear before the committee.

On October 31, therefore, the chairman of the committee, acting on the basis of its instructions, addressed the following letter to Secretary Rusk:

OCTOBER 31, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Committee on Foreign Relations has discussed your October 19 response to our letter of the 12th which invited you to appear before the Committee in public session to discuss issues raised by our policies with respect to Vietnam. Particular attention was given to your belief that you should instead appear at an executive session.

The Committee has agreed to invite you to attend an executive session designed primarily to elicit and consider your reasons for preferring to avoid a meeting with Committee members before the public. At that session there would, of course, be ample opportunity for substantive discussion about Vietnam policy and other issues.

Assuming your concurrence, Mr. Marcy of the Committee staff will contact Assistant Secretary Macomber to determine an appropriate time for the meeting.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Chairman.

On November 1, Secretary Rusk replied to the chairman as follows:

NOVEMBER 1, 1967.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I will be pleased to attend an Executive session of the Committee on Foreign Relations as discussed in our recent correspondence.

As you suggest, I will ask Mr. Macomber to arrange with Mr. Marcy a mutually convenient time for the meeting.

Sincerely yours

DEAN RUSK.

On November 7, Secretary Rusk met with the Committee on Foreign Relations and for more than 3 hours discussed not only his reluctance to appear before the committee, but some aspects of American involvement in Vietnam.

At the end of that hearing the Secretary indicated that he wanted further time to consider whether he would comply with the committee's request for a public hearing on Vietnam and, when pressed for a time by which he might decide whether to comply with the committee request, he said he would reply promptly.

Mr. President, that commitment was made on November 7. It is now November 28, 3 weeks later.

Since February of 1966 no member of the administration has been willing to meet in open session with elected representatives of the American people to discuss the subject of Vietnam.

This fact speaks for itself.

The Constitution clearly places the President of the United States and the U.S. Senate in a position of limited partnership with respect to U.S. foreign policy, its formation and its conduct. What other meaning can be assigned to the provisions for advice and consent, provisions for the Armed Forces, ratification, confirmation, et cetera? The Secretary of State is an agent of the President in this field; the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the agent of the U.S. Senate.

I believe it is a matter of national importance that an equation of comity and mutual responsibility between the President and the Senate be preserved and promoted. It is for this reason that I have been patient, but pressing. I believe it is for this reason that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been patient, but pressing. I hope that before the meeting tomorrow the committee will have an affirmative reply from Secretary Rusk. If not, it is my purpose then to renew my motion to instruct and authorize the chairman of the committee to communicate directly to President Johnson the committee's concern over the threatened breakdown in communication and public dialog between the Executive and the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6111) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MACGREGOR, and Mr. MCCLORY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2147) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska and I have discussed his amendment. We also discussed it before it was offered, and, we have been discussing it since it has been offered.

In view of the colloquy that has taken place and the discussions that we have indulged in, I am willing to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I will vote for the pending legislation. Before doing so, however, I wish to make clear my interpretation of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

Yesterday, a stimulating debate was entered into on the Senate floor by Senator MONTOYA, Senator MONDALE, Senator MILLER, Senator HRUSKA, and myself, concerning Federal inspection of foreign meats which are imported into this country. I will not deal further with that question today.

Another question remains to be clarified, however, after a study of the Senate committee's report. This question centers around Federal-State regulation of intrastate products. In my opinion, the Senate committee, in its report, failed to adequately define interstate commerce. We are forced, therefore, to go back to the clear action taken by the House Committee on Agriculture, when it met the commerce question head-on.

Reading from the House committee report, on page 3, I note that—

As the committee developed this legislation it found three basic approaches available to meet the need for adequate consumer protection.

The first alternative was to expand Federal inspection services to all intrastate slaughtering and processing facilities. This approach would have eliminated State inspection programs and assigned the responsibility for strictly State and local health protection exclusively to the Federal Government. The committee rejected, by a 29-to-5 vote, a substitute bill which would have given the Federal Government direct inspection authority over a large area of the intrastate slaughter and processing of meats by assuming that any persons, firm, or establishment doing more than \$250,000 annual business within a State would have substantial effect on interstate commerce, regardless of whether the product moved across a State line. . . .

In supporting this bill, it is my view that State regulation of intrastate activity should remain intact. The Secretary should be under no illusion that his power to regulate extends to intrastate plants where such plants are properly covered by State regulations which are at least equal to the Federal inspection system. The Secretary's regulatory activity, therefore, should extend only to those States which fail to develop an inspection system as set out in the pending bill.

It is my hope that the House-Senate conferees will meet the question of State versus Federal regulatory power in a head-on and forthright fashion. If this is done, much of the confusion which attends the present Senate version of the bill can be dispelled. I am sure that the conferees will agree that there should be no preemption by the Federal Government of the jurisdiction of the States over intrastate commerce, except in the specific areas that I have outlined here.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah such time as he may require.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

I wish to propound two or three questions to the manager of the bill. First, I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Minnesota for the fine work they have done in this most important field. It is a field of great concern, because the health of our country must be guarded, and this is a governmental function.

As we become more urban, and as we move around more, there is less opportunity for the individual to take the necessary steps to safeguard the purity of his food, especially meat. So this is a field that certainly requires the attention of government, and it must be brought into focus in order to protect the health of the people of our country. Some of the information that has developed in the course of the hearings and the discussion of this bill would indicate that some problem areas, without doubt, must be corrected.

First, may I ask the Senator from New Mexico whether I am correct in my understanding that the bill applies only to the traditional meat animals—that is, meat that is sold in commercial channels—and that it does not apply to the dressing or processing of game meat, such as deer, elk, and animals of that type.

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator's understanding is correct. The bill contains a specification as to what animals are encompassed in its provisions, and game animals are not included.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator.

I have had some correspondence with the chairman of the State board of agriculture in Utah, who has expressed some concern about various parts of the bill.

In Utah, we have a system of meat inspection which is administered by the State, and it seems to me that this system is adequate now. The chairman of the agriculture commission is concerned about the many small slaughter houses that exist in the State. Some of these operate 3 days a week or less, and he is concerned lest the requirements of this bill would so change the conditions that many of these small plants would not be able to meet the requirements and would have to be closed.

Is there an answer to him with respect to this question?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes. There is no reason for this fear on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture of the State of Utah, because the State of Utah has a mandatory inspection law which, if enforced adequately, satisfies the criteria in the bill and will permit the State of Utah to

S 17248

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 28, 1967

continue with its State enforcement system as it is doing at present. The bill specifically provides that this may be done.

If the State of Utah continues with its mandatory inspection system, with enforcement equivalent to Federal enforcement, no provision in the bill would bring these small plants under the Federal inspection system.

However, if the State of Utah does not enforce its State law and permits some of these small plants to sell meat that is not wholesome, the Federal inspectors will catch that plant eventually.

An additional safeguard is provided, in that the Secretary of Agriculture, at the national level, before he brings this violating plant under the Federal inspection system will certify the violations he has found to the Governor of the State and the State advisory committee or whoever the person might be who is in charge of State enforcement for meat inspection purposes, and say to him, first, "Correct what is going on in your State in plant A. This is what we found."

If they do not do it, if they do not have any corrective measures applied, the Secretary of Agriculture under the bill would be obligated to take that plant under Federal inspection not ad infinitum, but until such time as in his discretion he can turn this plant back over to the State with the assurance that adequate local inspection will protect the consumer.

Mr. MOSS. Do I understand from the statement of the Senator that the Federal Government, in determining whether or not the State is doing an adequate job of inspection and assuring wholesome meat, looks to the end result of the product that comes out rather than turning attention on the number of feet of floor space and the physical layout?

Mr. MONTROYA. The Senator is correct. Yesterday we had a colloquy on the floor of the Senate with respect to that proposition and I made a statement that the Secretary of Agriculture has not to this day, although he has the authority, imposed any architectural requirements upon those who are under the inspection system of the Federal Government. It is not the intention of the bill to exact any innovation to conform with architectural requirements on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture.

There is no such requirement in the bill. In fact, there is a legislative history on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report which specifically clarifies this particular point as I have explained it.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question?

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. The bill provides for Federal matching funds to enable States to improve and continue their inspection systems. What is the answer to the criticism leveled that a State really by refusing to do any of this work will then get Federal inspection brought in, paid for entirely by the Federal Government, so that they will get a full 100-percent service in this area without any State money, as against another State, such as Utah, which has an inspection system and now expends \$160,000 a year in inspection money? Is there equity there?

Mr. MONTROYA. I may say that there is no other way we can protect the American consumer except the way we are doing it here unless we have mandatory inspection across the board. That is the other alternative.

Under our constitutional form of government, the police power rests in the State governments and the States. We are trying to go in under the interstate commerce clause because we feel the States have not assumed complete responsibility of their police power functions in protecting the consumers of this Nation.

We are saying, in effect, to the States, "While some of you have assumed police powers adequate to protect consumers, we want you to do this and we will help you. We will provide facilities and money on the part of the Federal Government to help you update inspection services for the protection of consumers. But if you do not do it, we are going to go in on behalf of the consumer and do it under the interstate commerce clause."

Actually, a progressive State such as the State of the Senator from Utah, with mandatory inspection, will never see the day when the Federal Government will step in to take it over if it continues to enforce its meat inspection laws.

Mr. MOSS. I concede that this is a rather farfetched hypothetical situation to presume that a State would be so derelict in its governmental function toward its own citizens that it would not be willing to move into this field. However, the question was raised and I am happy that the Senator has answered the question. I am sure that my State wants to continue and that it will continue in this field, and Federal supplementary financial aid would be welcomed by the State. I would not suppose there would be any States which would refuse entirely to bear their fair share.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MONDALE. We had tried to deal with this problem in the deliberations in connection with the bill because we really had three alternatives available to us if we begin with the position that there could be no compromise with Federal health. First, we could immediately impose a Federal inspection system on all meat processed, which was my proposal; second, we could give the States the opportunity to continue to maintain jurisdiction over intrastate plants if they maintained a system at least equal to the Federal system, which was the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA]; and third, we could force them to do so without any help whatsoever. A legal tool could be devised to require that.

It seems to me that what some States are saying is that none of those systems is adequate. It is a fine debating point but no matter which way we moved, we found ourselves with some logical difficulty.

Under the proposal here today, it is possible for the State to say, "Why should we assume our responsibility and pay one-half of the cost for an inspection

system when by waiving the time, we can have the Federal Government come in and do it at their expense."

Our first assumption is that most States have more pride than that. Most of them will take the help offered to do a good job. Speaking only for myself, if we find some States have so little respect for their State systems, that they waive it, we should take another look at it, so that we are not rewarding those States that do not have the pride I think they should have in their own jurisdictions.

The reaction of my State has been one of basic approval, except for the Governor. They feel as do most States, that the aid we are offering here will give them the tool they need. Their attitude has not been, "We will give up."

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator. I commend him and the Senator from New Mexico for their leadership. I support the bill before us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have one question and then, if the Senator will yield, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think I know the answer to the question I shall ask because I have discussed it with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the manager of the bill, and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], who is the cosponsor of the bill now before us. However, I think it would be well to have the answer in the Record.

I am in receipt of a telegram from Buren Bonine, Miles City, Mont., which reads as follows:

Please make sure Federal meat inspection bill presently before the Senate includes imported meat.

Would the Senator care to make comment for the Record on that question?

Mr. MONTROYA. Yes. We have in the bill a very strong provision with respect to imported meat; which varies from the existing authority which the Secretary of Agriculture has under the Tariff Act. We have also adopted an amendment this morning which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to file an exhaustive and complete report with respect to imported meat.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is very satisfactory.

Will the Senator now yield so that I may propound the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending measure take place at 2:15 this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Is the Senator asking that rule XI be suspended for that purpose?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; that the rule be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator for yielding.